



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,178	12/27/2000	Takuya Uchiyama	1614.1108	2991

21171 7590 01/05/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

AWAD, AMR A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,178

Applicant(s)

UCHIYAMA, TAKUYA

Examiner

Amr Awad

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-8, 17-24 and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Independent claims 1, 5, 17, 21 and 33, recite the limitation "calculating a distance between coordinate values of previous and current input operations by said input unit, the coordinate values being successive over detachment of the input device from the surface of said input unit". This limitation is not recited in the specification. Specifically, there is no teaching in the specification of having the coordinate values being successive over detachment of the input device. Applicant's specification recites, "The points e and f shown in FIG. 9B are output as previous and current values h and I, respectively in FIG. 10B." (Part of paragraph # 90), and also recites "The coordinate values of a press end point e, at which a pen or a finger is detached from the surface of the coordinate input panel after continuously pressing the surface, and a press start point f, at which the pen or the finger starts pressing the surface, are obtained by considering an imaginary distance g" (paragraph # 88). This simply means that the current coordinate point f in figure 9B is a coordinate of the input

Art Unit: 2675

device is pressed (i.e., attached), which followed the previous coordinate e created upon the detachment of the input device. It also means that the calculated distance (the imaginary distance g) is the distance between point f(created by attachment), and point e (created by detachment). This goes against the claimed limitation "successive over detachment of the input device".

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. All independent claims recite, "coordinate values of previous and current input operation", or "coordinate value of a first input operation and a coordinate value of a second input operation". This limitation is not clear because there is no specific recitation of whether the coordinate values of the current, previous, first or second of the input operation is the beginning, end or middle of the operation. As indicated in the 112 1st rejection above, while claims 1, 5, 17, 21 and 33, recite, "calculating a distance between coordinate values of previous and current input operations by said input unit, the coordinate values being successive over detachment of the input device from the surface of said input unit", the specification recites, "The points e and f shown in FIG. 9B are output as previous and current values h and I, respectively in FIG. 10B." (Part of paragraph # 90), and also recites "The coordinate values of a press end point e, at which a pen or a finger is detached from the surface of

Art Unit: 2675

the coordinate input panel after continuously pressing the surface, and a press start point f, at which the pen or the finger starts pressing the surface, are obtained by considering an imaginary distance g" (paragraph # 88), which makes the coordinate values to be the detachment point sometimes, and the attachment point in some other times.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loudon et al. (US patent NO. 6,556,712; hereinafter referred to as Loudon).

As to claim 1, Loudon teaches a coordinate detection device, comprising:

an input unit (computer system 100 in figure 2), having a surface (tablet 50 in figure 3) thereof, to which a coordinate value is input by an input means device (handwriting input device 125 in figure 2); a calculation unit calculating a distance between coordinate values of previous and current input operations by said input unit (for that, Loudon shows that two strokes are interpolated between by providing interpolated points between consecutive strokes, and that the number of points added for connecting the two strokes are based on the distance between the two strokes) (col. 12, lines 21-34), the coordinate values being successive over detachment of the input

Art Unit: 2675

means device from the surface of said input unit (because Loudon shows that the distance are between two consecutive strokes).

Loudon does not specifically teach a setting unit setting, in said calculation unit, a coordinate value at a time when the input means device is detached from the surface of said input unit as the coordinate value of the previous input operation.

However, to compare the speed or the distance between two strokes; Loudon specifically states, "The first connection point (e.g. point 374a) is calculated by finding the average direction and speed of the last few points (e.g. 3 points) of the previous stroke to be connected and linearly interpolating based on these values. The number and position of the remaining connecting points, such as points 374b and 374c are based on the same speed value and by linearly interpolating between the first connecting point and the first point in the next stroke." (Col. 12, lines 35-42). This simply means that the device of Loudon always compare previous and next strokes to each other to calculate the speed and the distance between the two strokes, which means that when a new stroke is entered, this stroke will be considered a next stroke, and the previous stroke will be considered as previous (i.e., previous input operation), and so on till the whole character is written.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize from the teaching of Loudon, that the since the device is comparing two consecutive strokes, there will be always a current and previous strokes (inputs), and that the newer entered stroke will be always considered

Art Unit: 2675

as the next stroke, and the previous will be considered as previous, which in turn facilitates the recognition of characters.

As to independent claims 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33 and 37, the claims are substantially similar to independent claim 1, and would be analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

7. Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, 14-16, 18-20, 22-24, 26-28, 30-32, 34-36 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loudon as applied to claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33 and 37 above, and further in view of Maxted (US patent NO. 6,340,967).

As to claims 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30, 34 and 38 as can be seen above, Loudon teaches all the limitations of the claims except the citation of determining an operation mode as a relative mode or an absolute mode of the input unit, and control unit that enables or disables the setting unit based on determination result of the determination unit.

However, Maxted teaches a pen based edit correction interface method and apparatus (title), wherein the device includes plurality of modes (one can be called absolute mode or relative mode) (col. 3, lines 26-39), and based on the determination result on the determination unit, a control units enables or disables the setting (for that, Maxted shows that if the tip of the pen is kept within predetermined distance from the last stroke, the mode will change) (col. 10, line 62 through col. 11, line 10).

Art Unit: 2675

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Maxted having multiple modes, to be incorporated to Loudon's device so as motivated by Maxted, by dividing functions into different modes, the reliability of recognition of the stroke will be increased (col. 3, lines 35-37).

As to claims 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31, 35 and 39; as discussed above, Maxted shows that the mode changes based on the distance between strokes (col. 10, lines 62, through col. 11, line 10).

As to claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32, 36 and 40, Maxted shows that mode changes based on the time (abstract).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Uchiyama et al. (US patent NO. 5,745,599) teaches character recognition method.

Art Unit: 2675

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amr Awad whose telephone number is (703)308-8485. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (703)305-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A.A.

AMR A. AWAD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Amr Awad", with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.